

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 have been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite and claims 1-5 were rejected as failing to define the invention.

Claims 5 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection and to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 5 has been amended herein to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections by removing the indefinite terminology and more clearly reciting the structure of the device. Amended claim 5 incorporates the limitations of claims 1 and 3.

Claim 6 has been amended in a similar manner and includes the limitations of claim 1.

Accordingly, allowance of amended claims 5 and 6 is respectfully requested.

New claim 7 has been inserted herein. Support for hook and niche is found in the specification on page 3, lines 15-21 and FIG. 2. It is submitted that the present device is distinguishable from the pull-out mechanism of *Rock et al.* The reference does not have an upturned hook on the upper surface of the telescopic guide. The hook 64 identified by the Examiner is downward projecting (column 4, line 41 and FIG. 4) and it is not formed on the upper surface of the telescopic guide. Further, *Rock et al* do not disclose nor suggest a niche formed within the opening near the rear of the box-type bar. The notch 67 identified by the Examiner is actually an upturned lower edge of the frame 28 which extends the length of the frame (column 4, lines 43-47 and FIGS. 1 and 4). Since the "hook 64" rests within the "notch 67", the hook can be lifted vertically and separation is not prevented. Due to the engagement of the hook 2a with the niche 3, the present

invention does not need the intermediate adapters 11, 17 and 18 disclosed by *Rock et al.* It is submitted that the *Rock et al* reference does not disclose nor suggest a structure as recited in claim 7 and even if combined with *Langenberg*, the resulting device would have an unrelated structure and separation of the box-type bar from the telescopic guide could not be prevented.

Accordingly, allowance of new claim 7 is respectfully requested.

New claim 8, dependent on claim 7, further discloses a flexible tongue on a wall of the box-type bar. The tongue is isolated between two notches and a seat is formed above the tongue. A tooth is formed on an inner wall of the telescopic guide and the tooth is housed within the seat on the tongue. None of the cited references suggest nor disclose this structure either individually or combined in any manner.

Accordingly, allowance of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

It appears that all matters have been addressed satisfactorily, and that the case is now in condition for a complete allowance; and the same is respectfully urged.

However, if the Examiner has any comments or questions, or has any suggestions as per MPEP 707.07 (d) and (j), for putting the case in condition for final allowance, he is respectfully

urged to contact the undersigned attorney-of-record at the telephone number below, so that an expeditious resolution may be effected and the case passed to issue promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

June 25, 2003  
Date

Robert M. Gamson

Robert M. Gamson  
Reg. No. 32,986  
Attorney for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMITTAL

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: January 25, 2003

Express Mail Label No. EV315411442US

By: Suzanne A. Bates

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP  
Intellectual Property Law Offices  
502 Washington Avenue, Suite 220  
Towson, MD 21204  
Telephone: (410) 337-2295  
Facsimile: (410) 337-2296

RMG/chb

C:\Core\Office7\WPWin7\Carolyn\amend\02003amd.wpd